

2003

# The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles

Mark A. Throntveit

*Luther Seminary*, [mthrontv@luthersem.edu](mailto:mthrontv@luthersem.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty\\_articles](https://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles)

 Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#), and the [Near Eastern Languages and Societies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Throntveit, Mark A., "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles" (2003). *Faculty Publications*. 287.

[https://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty\\_articles/287](https://digitalcommons.luthersem.edu/faculty_articles/287)

## Published Citation

Throntveit, Mark A. "The Relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon in the Books of Chronicles." In *Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*, edited by M. Patrick Graham, 105–21. London: T & T Clark, 2003.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty & Staff Scholarship at Digital Commons @ Luther Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Luther Seminary. For more information, please contact [tracy.iwaskow@gmail.com](mailto:tracy.iwaskow@gmail.com), [mteske@luthersem.edu](mailto:mteske@luthersem.edu).

## THE RELATIONSHIP OF HEZEKIAH TO DAVID AND SOLOMON IN THE BOOKS OF CHRONICLES\*

Mark A. Throntveit

The space which the Chronicler has devoted to Hezekiah's story is one way of expressing that Hezekiah is the greatest Judean monarch after David and Solomon.

—Sara Japhet<sup>1</sup>

Given the scholarly consensus expressed above by Japhet, what is the relationship between the Chronicler's three royal luminaries: David, Solomon, and Hezekiah?<sup>2</sup> The portrayal of Hezekiah in 2 Chronicles 29–32 comes at a crucial juncture in the Chronicler's presentation. This is indicated, in part, by the extent to which he diverges from his *Vorlage*, 2 Kings 18–20.<sup>3</sup> Nearly all commentators draw attention to the fact that 2 Kings and Isaiah devote the bulk of their accounts to such political matters as Sennacherib's invasion, Hezekiah's illness, and the Babylonian intrigue to elicit Hezekiah's support against Assyria (2 Kgs 18.9–20.19//

\* An earlier version of this study was presented in a special session of the 'Chronicles–Ezra–Nehemiah Section' of the SBL (Chicago, 1988) and appeared as 'Hezekiah in the Books of Chronicles', in D.J. Lull (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers* (SBLSP, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), pp. 302–11, at the request of Ralph Klein. It is a pleasure to dedicate this version to Ralph—friend, colleague, fellow Lutheran...and my mother's 'favorite adult forum speaker'.

1. S. Japhet, *I and II Chronicles* (OTL; Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), p. 912.

2. In this study, 'the Chronicler' will be used to designate the anonymous author of 1–2 Chronicles, a work composed in Jerusalem sometime during the Persian Period. The book of Ezra–Nehemiah, while sharing some of the concerns of the Chronicler and coming from roughly the same time, is from a different hand. For a concise treatment of these issues, see R.W. Klein, 'Chronicles, Book of 1–2', in *ABD*, I, pp. 992–1002.

3. See the helpful synoptic comparisons in *Hezekiah in Chronicles and Kings (Isaiah): A Synopsis by Ralph W. Klein*, available online at <<http://www.ot-studies.com/Documents/hezekiah.htm>>.

Isa. 36.1–39.8), relegating Hezekiah's reforms to a single verse (2 Kgs 18.4). In stark contrast to this, the Chronicler apportions three chapters to the reform (2 Chron. 29–31) and treats the more political concerns that exercised his predecessors in an abbreviated and theologically motivated fashion (2 Chron. 32).<sup>4</sup>

With regard to these more political concerns, the Chronicler's tendency to idealize pious kings by the omission of material deemed to be inconsistent with their characterization is particularly evident.<sup>5</sup> The omission of 2 Kgs 18.14–16 (the deuteronomistic first stage of the invasion that reports Hezekiah's capitulation and attempt to appease Sennacherib with tribute payments), as well as the drastic abridgement of 2 Kgs 18.17–37//Isa. 36.2–22 (Sennacherib's demand for capitulation through his messenger), and 2 Kgs 19.1–34//Isa. 37.1–35 (Hezekiah's appeal), provide the clearest examples of this perspective.<sup>6</sup> Less clear are the reasons for the Chronicler's presentation of Hezekiah's illness and recovery (2 Chron. 32.24–31//2 Kgs 20.1–19).<sup>7</sup> By adding a note stating, 'God left him to himself, in order to try him and to know all that was in his heart' (v. 31b),

4. See, especially, H.G.M. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1982), pp. 350–88; S.L. McKenzie, *The Chronicler's Use of the Deuteronomistic History* (HSM, 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 159–68; R.B. Dillard, *2 Chronicles* (WBC, 15; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), pp. 226–61; Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 910–98; L.C. Allen, 'The First and Second Books of Chronicles', in *NIB*, III, pp. 602–32; and S. Tuell, *First and Second Chronicles* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 2001), pp. 211–30.

5. In his unpublished dissertation, W.F. Lemke has shown that the Chronicler usually idealizes pious kings by omitting derogatory material, 'Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History' (ThD dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1964), p. 245; see as well his 'The Synoptic Problem in the Chronicler's History', *HTR* 58 (1965), pp. 349–63. The retention of material critical of Solomon (2 Chron. 10.4, 10–11, 14//1 Kgs 12.4, 10–11, 14), however, suggests that this chronistic characteristic needs to be used with caution. See B.E. Kelly, 'Messianic Elements in the Chronicler's Work', in P.E. Satterthwaite, R.S. Hess and G.J. Wenham (eds.), *The Lord's Anointed: Interpretations of Old Testament Messianic Texts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1995), pp. 257–58; and my 'The Idealization of Solomon as the Glorification of God in the Chronicler's Royal Speeches and Royal Prayers', in L.K. Handy (ed.), *The Age of Solomon: Scholarship at the Turn of the Millennium* (Studies in the History and Culture of the Ancient Near East, 11; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1997), pp. 411–27.

6. See Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, pp. 255–56.

7. For helpful suggestions regarding the significance of Babylon for the Chronicler's interpretation, see P.R. Ackroyd, 'The Chronicler as Exegete', *JSOT* 2 (1977), pp. 2–32.

the Chronicler has positively reinterpreted his *Vorlage* to present a blemish as a beauty mark.

As one might expect from this brief sketch, the secondary literature concerned with these chapters (especially ch. 32), their parallels, and the thorny historical and theological problems that grow out of their inter-relationship is immense, certainly too vast to be covered within this limited space.<sup>8</sup> Thus, this article will confine itself to one significant aspect of the Chronicler's distinctive account: the relationship of Hezekiah to David and Solomon.

The debate as to whether the Chronicler seeks to depict Hezekiah as a second David or a second Solomon continues to uncover proposed Davidic and Solomonian allusions in Hezekiah. While many of the comparisons between these kings are valid, there appears to be no means by which these claims may be judged. A modest start in this direction might be made with the proposal of two simple criteria: (1) that the alleged comparison be unique to the Chronicler, and (2) that the alleged comparison only occurs with reference to Hezekiah and David and/or Solomon alone. Justification for the first criterion arises from contemporary scholarship's reluctance to utilize material already present in the Chronicler's *Vorlage* in the construction of a chronistic theological perspective without extensive critical examination.<sup>9</sup> The same may be said for those elements of 'pro-priestly revision',<sup>10</sup> that appear in parts of 1 Chronicles 15–16 and 23–27. It will become evident in the course of this study that this criterion is of relatively little importance for this investigation.

8. Dillard (2 *Chronicles*, p. 226) provides a helpful introductory bibliography of materials that present the classic arguments and positions.

9. T. Willi's insistence on the importance of the parallel passages and consequent detailed analysis of the Chronicler's 'exegesis' of the sacred text found in Samuel-Kings serves only as a corrective to wholesale neglect of the *Vorlage*. See his *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (FRLANT, 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

10. The term is Williamson's, who uses it to denote the redactor(s) responsible for the minor expansions in 1 Chron. 15–16 and the more extensive additions to 1 Chron. 23–27, correcting the Chronicler's neglect of the priests in relation to the Levites and providing Davidic legitimation for both. On the whole question, see Williamson, 'The Origins of the Twenty-Four Priestly Courses: A Study of I Chronicles xxiii–xxvii', in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (VTSup, 30; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), pp. 251–68; and J.W. Wright's counter-proposal in 'The Legacy of David in Chronicles: The Narrative Function of I Chronicles 23–27', *JBL* 110 (1991), pp. 229–42.

Such is not the case, however, for the second criterion. Here, much confusion exists, with the result that characteristic expressions applied to many of the Chronicler's favorites are adduced in support of the contention that Hezekiah is being presented as either a second David or a second Solomon rather than simply one of the pious Davidic kings the Chronicler holds up to his people. On the other hand, Japhet has recently argued that the comparisons drawn between Hezekiah and David and/or Solomon also appear for other kings, suggesting that the figure of Hezekiah

and that of his reign, are idiosyncratic, with their own specific features and contours, determined by Hezekiah's personality, specific historical position, and the data from which his portrait is structured...a figure who should be seen in the lively particulars of his person, deeds and historical circumstances, rather than in the generals of a stereotypical 'type'.<sup>11</sup>

Both of these misappropriations can be avoided by rigorous adherence to our second criterion: that the alleged comparison only occurs with reference to Hezekiah, David and/or Solomon alone.

I turn now to an examination of the major attempts to see Hezekiah as either a second David or a second Solomon in light of these criteria.

### *Hezekiah as a Second David*

The major attempt to see Hezekiah as a second David is that of R. Mosis.<sup>12</sup> This is a corollary to his suggestion that the Chronicler has adopted the reigns of Saul, David, and Solomon as paradigms of three possible situations in which Israel might be found: Saul's apostasy, David's faithfulness, or Solomon's future blessing.<sup>13</sup> Since Solomon's realization is by definition future-oriented, Hezekiah must be patterned on either Saul or David. Thus, Mosis calls Hezekiah 'a second David',<sup>14</sup> based upon the following evidence. First, 2 Chron. 29.2 claims that Hezekiah 'did what was right in the eyes of the Lord, according to all that David his father had done'. Second, 2 Chron. 32.1-23 describes Jerusalem's deliverance from Sennacherib and so parallels the description in 1 Chronicles 14 of David's deliverance from the Philistines. Both describe a victory over foreign powers as a reward for seeking either Yahweh or the ark, and

11. Japhet, *I and II Chronicles*, p. 998.

12. R. Mosis, *Untersuchungen zur Theologie des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes* (FTS, 92; Freiburg: Herder, 1973), pp. 164-69.

13. Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, p. 165.

14. Mosis, *Untersuchungen*, p. 189: '...einen zweiten David'.

Hezekiah's military preparations and the Assyrian invasion itself preclude comparisons with Solomon, 'the man of peace'. Finally, after claiming that the postexilic restoration of the cult in Ezra 1-6 is typologically Davidic, Mosis displays the parallels between this restoration and Hezekiah's cleansing of the temple and Passover (2 Chron. 29.3-31.1).

H.G.M. Williamson<sup>15</sup> has challenged these comparisons by arguing, first, that *Vorlage* considerations considerably weaken the force of 2 Chron. 29.2, which simply reproduces the earlier deuteronomistic judgment of 2 Kgs 18.3, itself a stereotyped formula.<sup>16</sup> Second, Williamson explains that 2 Chron. 32.1-23 has been carefully reworked to omit Hezekiah's initial capitulation (2 Kgs 18.14-16) and the taking of Judah's fortified cities (2 Kgs 18.13//Isa. 36.1), obvious *Vorlage* alterations that tell against Mosis. In addition, in Chronicles the victory was due to Yahweh's intervention, not Hezekiah's military activities ('the Lord saved Hezekiah', 2 Chron. 32.22, no parallel). Furthermore, the omission of 2 Kgs 18.7b-8 ('He rebelled against the king of Assyria, and would not serve him. He smote the Philistines as far as Gaza and its territory, from watchtower to fortified city') suggests that the Chronicler may have intended to portray Hezekiah, at least partially, as a 'man of peace'. Finally on this point, the unparalleled notice that 'Solomon went to Hamath-zobah, and took it' (2 Chron. 8.3) calls into question an unqualified depiction of a peaceful Solomon. Williamson's last observation is that the parallel with Ezra 1-6, of course, depends upon the prior assumption of the common authorship of Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah.<sup>17</sup>

Williamson's critique is convincing, but it by no means exhausts the possible allusions to David that have been suggested. In a detailed article discussing the Chronicler's thematic structure, Halpern<sup>18</sup> collects several

15. H.G.M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977), pp. 124-25.

16. Japhet (*I and II Chronicles*, p. 915) thinks that this is a 'significant element in the Chronicler's portrayal of Hezekiah' and questions Williamson's dismissal of the comparison as a 'stereotyped expression', noting that 'the Chronicler has systematically omitted all comparisons to David found in Kings...except for the stories of Hezekiah here and Josiah in 34.2'.

17. For another review of the persistent question of authorship in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah see M.J.D. Selman, *1 Chronicles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC, 10a; Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1994), pp. 65-71, and the bibliography cited there.

18. B. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology: Chronicles' Thematic Structure—Indications of an Earlier Source', in R.E. Friedman (ed.), *The Creation of*

motifs that may be construed as effecting parallels, although it must be acknowledged that this is not Halpern's purpose in presenting these parallels and that he himself is convinced of the Chronicler's intention to portray Hezekiah as a second Solomon.<sup>19</sup> Of these, the motif of prosperity, often marked with the formula 'wealth and honor', is the most pervasive. 1 Chronicles 18.2-11 presents a series of reports depicting David's exacting of tribute. These may be paired with the notice that 'many brought gifts to the Lord to Jerusalem and precious things to Hezekiah king of Judah', (2 Chron. 32.23a, no parallel). It must be questioned, however, if the exacting of tribute is the same thing as receiving gifts. It is also striking that several texts dealing with David's transfer of kingship to Solomon (1 Chron. 22.3-4, 5b, 14-16; 28.1, 14-18; 29.2-5, 6-8, 12, 21) repeat the motif of wealth and parallel similar statements about Hezekiah's wealth (2 Chron. 30.24-26; 31.4-12; both without parallel in Kings). Third, David's regnal summary contains the notice that David 'died in a good old age, full of days, riches, and honor' (1 Chron. 29.28), which is picked up in the summary of Hezekiah's reign (2 Chron. 32.27-30, no parallel) and 2 Chron. 32.23b (no parallel), 'he was exalted in the sight of all nations from that time onward'. 1 Chronicles 14.1, 2, 17, might be cited as a closer parallel.

While all these references to Hezekiah's prosperity are without *Vorlage*, and so may be construed to arise from the Chronicler's intention to portray Hezekiah as a wealthy and highly honored king in the Davidic tradition, the Chronicler has also utilized this motif to enhance the positive portrayal of other pious Judean kings, most notably Solomon (2 Chron. 1.12, 14-17; 2.6-9; 3.4-7, 14; 4.7-8, 18, 19-22; 5.1; 8.17-18; 9.9-28), but also Asa (14.12-15, no parallel), Jehoshaphat (17.5, 9, 11; 20.25, no parallel), Uzziah (26.6-15, no parallel) and Jotham (27.3-5, no parallel).

A similar situation obtains with the motif of victory in war that is depicted as the result of the king's seeking Yahweh. David's victory in 1 Chron. 14.13-17 is paralleled with that of Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32.1-23), but also with those of Asa (14.6, 10-14, no parallel), Jehoshaphat (20.1-30, no parallel), Amaziah (25.7-10, 11-13, no parallel), Uzziah (26.5-6, no parallel) and Jotham (27.5-6, no parallel).

The presence of these motifs in conjunction with other Davidic kings lessens their significance for our purposes. This is not the case with

*Sacred Literature: Composition and Redaction of the Biblical Text* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), pp. 35-54.

19. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 51.

Halpern's isolation of the motif of Yahweh saving the king. 2 Chronicles 32.22 reports Yahweh saving Hezekiah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem and recalls the same notice with regard to David, who was also saved wherever he went (1 Chron. 18.6, 13//2 Sam. 8.6, 14).<sup>20</sup> The only other relevant occurrence (1 Chron. 11.14) is textually suspect precisely at the word 'save', though it, too, relates to David.<sup>21</sup>

Dillard has suggested other Davidic parallels for Hezekiah (listed in increasing order of probability):

1. 2 Chronicles 32.6 describes Hezekiah's appointment of military officers and 'mirrors the earlier work of David (1 Chr 23-27)'.<sup>22</sup> David's activity, however, is limited to ch. 27, which is to be regarded as secondary.<sup>23</sup>
2. 2 Chronicles 32.21, which mentions the destroying angel, 'recalls events after David's census (2 Sam 24 // 1 Chr 21)'.<sup>24</sup> The differences between these two accounts make the parallel somewhat improbable, even if the parallel satisfies the requirements of our criteria.
3. 2 Chronicles 31.11-14 deals with Hezekiah's provision for store-rooms in the temple under the auspices of the Levites. Dillard pairs it with David's similar activities in 1 Chron. 9.26; 23.28; 26.22 and 28.12.<sup>25</sup> As only Hezekiah and David are connected in this way and in the absence of *Vorlage* difficulties, we may accept this judgment in the case of 9.26; 26.22 and 28.12. 1 Chronicles 23.28, however, as part of the pro-priestly revision, must be excluded from consideration.
4. 2 Chronicles 32.5b ('and he strengthened the Millo in the City of David') is the most interesting in this regard, since Dillard claims this activity 'likens Hezekiah once again to David and Solomon (1 Chron. 11.8; 1 Kgs 11.27)'.<sup>26</sup> While the Davidic reference is secure, the reference to Solomon has been omitted by the

20. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 51.

21. Instead of the MT's יְיָשָׁע ('Yahweh saved'), the LXX, Syriac and Arabic read יָעַשׂ ('Yahweh did').

22. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 257.

23. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 174.

24. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 258.

25. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 251.

26. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 257.



Chronicler and so is found only in Kings.<sup>27</sup> I find myself in agreement with Coggins, who says that 'Here as elsewhere it appears as if a deliberate comparison is being made between Hezekiah and David'.<sup>28</sup>

5. In 2 Chron. 30.12, the expression 'the people acted with one accord' (literally, 'one heart/mind', לֵב אֶחָד), one of the Chronicler's ways of emphasizing the 'undivided loyalty of the people toward pious kings', finds an exact match only in 1 Chron. 12.39 (EVV v. 38), the report of David's accession.<sup>29</sup>

Further examples of the Chronicler's intention to depict Hezekiah as a second David that are not paralleled in his *Vorlage* and that apply only to these two kings are found in Hezekiah's royal speeches (2 Chron. 30.6-9; 32.7-8).<sup>30</sup> 2 Chronicles 30.6 refers to 'the God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel', recalling the same epithet in David's prayer (1 Chron. 29.18). The only other instances of this expression in the Hebrew Bible are found on the lips of Moses (Exod. 32.13, without 'the God of') and Elijah (1 Kgs 18.36). The tenor of this speech, which seeks to gather all Israel—particularly those 'brothers' from the North—for cultic reform, echoes David's similar concern at the start of his reign (1 Chron. 13.1-4).

The admonition, 'Be strong and courageous, do not fear or be dismayed', in Hezekiah's second speech (2 Chron. 32.7), parallels exactly David's words of encouragement to Solomon (1 Chron. 22.13), except for David's singular imperatives and Hezekiah's plural imperatives, due to their respective audiences. Furthermore, both pairs of imperatives are

27. See P. Welten, *Geschichte und Geschichtsdarstellung in den Chronikbüchern* (WMANT, 42; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1973), p. 71: 'Amazingly, apart from our place, "Millo" occurs in Chronicles only at 1 Chron. 11.8 in conjunction with David's conquest of the city. "Millo" is completely lacking in the Solomon traditions, where the expression, though occurring at 1 Kgs 9.15, 24; 11.27, is totally ignored by the Chronicler' ('Millo begegnet erstaunlicherweise in der Chronik, abgesehen von unserer Stelle, nur 1 Chr 11,8 im Zusammenhang mit der Eroberung der Stadt durch David. Ganz fehlt Millo in der Salomoüberlieferung, wo der Ausdruck 1 Kön 9,15.24; 11,27 noch begegnet, was vom Chronisten völlig übergangen wird').

28. R.J. Coggins, *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles* (CBC; London: Cambridge University Press, 1976), p. 281.

29. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 245 (my emphasis).

30. On the significance of the royal speeches for the structure and theology of the books of Chronicles, see my *When Kings Speak: Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles* (SBLDS, 93; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

repeated in 1 Chron. 28.20, where David again encourages his son (separated only by 'and do'), which refers to the building of the temple and is not relevant to Hezekiah's audience. Since it too makes use of the second pair of imperatives, Jehoshaphat's salvation oracle (2 Chron. 20.15, 17) might be cited in refutation of this evidence. It is the combination of the two sets of imperatives that is most important, however, and this combination occurs only in the references to David and Hezekiah.

Four items, then, meet our criteria: Hezekiah and David are compared concerning the matters of the storerooms (1 Chron. 9.26; 26.22; 28.12; 2 Chron. 31.11-14); לֵב אֶחָד (1 Chron. 12.39 [EVV v. 38]; 2 Chron. 30.12); reference to 'the God of Abraham, Isaac, and *Israel*' (1 Chron. 29.18; 2 Chron. 30.6); and the encouragement formulae of 1 Chron. 22.13; 2 Chron. 32.7. We may conclude from this investigation that the Chronicler is concerned to depict Hezekiah as a second David in ways that other pious Judean kings are not.

### *Hezekiah as a Second Solomon*

The most persuasive attempt to argue that the Chronicler regarded Hezekiah as a second Solomon is that of Williamson.<sup>31</sup> This argument is a corollary of his suggestion that 'in Hezekiah's recapitulation of Solomon's achievements it is as though the Chronicler is taking us back prior to the point of division where the one Israel is united around a single temple under the authority of the Davidic king'.<sup>32</sup> Of the evidence he presents in favor of his position, six items are especially cogent.

First, 2 Chron. 30.26 ('So there was great joy in Jerusalem, for since the time of Solomon the son of David king of Israel there had been nothing like this in Jerusalem') is 'certainly the most obvious link between Hezekiah and Solomon and it is one which could not be said of any of the intervening kings'.<sup>33</sup>

Second, 2 Chron. 30.23, in which the whole assembly decides to keep the feast for an additional seven days, strongly recalls the prolongation of the feast at the dedication of the temple by Solomon in 2 Chron. 7.8, 9.<sup>34</sup>

31. Williamson, *Israel*, pp. 119-25; *idem*, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 350-88.

32. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 351.

33. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 371.

34. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 371; cf. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 229.

Third, 2 Chron. 30.6-19 employs four verbs of repentance that figured prominently in Yahweh's answer to Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple (2 Chron. 7.14): 'repent, return' (שוב, vv. 6, 8, 9), 'humble oneself' (נִפְחַל niphal, v. 11), 'pray' (הִתְפַּלֵּל, v. 18; cf. 30.20, 24) and a synonym for 'seek' (דָּרַשׁ, v. 19; בָּקַשׁ in 7.14).<sup>35</sup> In addition, Yahweh promises (7.14) that if his people 'who are called by my name humble themselves, and pray and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin and heal their land', terminology that is picked up in 2 Chron. 30.20: 'And the Lord heard Hezekiah and healed the people'. While *some* of these verbs are employed in the descriptions of subsequent kings,<sup>36</sup> which is only to be expected given the paradigmatic nature of both the prayer and the divine response for the Chronicler's presentation, *all* of these references coalesce only in the Chronicler's treatment of Hezekiah.

Fourth, in the midst of 2 Chron. 30.9 ('[they] will find compassion with their captors') is an echo of 1 Kgs 8.50 ('grant them compassion in the sight of those who carried them captive'). The second half of 1 Kgs 8.50 was omitted in the Chronicler's parallel account of Solomon's prayer at the temple dedication, only to appear here in the mouth of Hezekiah, the second Solomon.<sup>37</sup>

Fifth, Hezekiah's immediate concern for the temple is emphasized at the time of his accession (2 Chron. 29.3) as was Solomon's (2 Chron. 1).

Sixth, at the end of their work on the temple (8.16; 29.35b) both kings receive similar summaries of their accomplishments.<sup>38</sup>

Williamson's other arguments for seeing Hezekiah as a second Solomon are less convincing:

First, it is difficult to see how *David's* words of encouragement to Solomon (1 Chron. 22.13; 28.10, 20), when repeated by Hezekiah (2 Chron. 32.7), make Hezekiah a second Solomon.<sup>39</sup>

35. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 367-70.

36. Surprisingly, in 2 Chron. 33.12-13 the reign of Manasseh is portrayed in this way. I am indebted to H.G.M. Williamson for bringing this to my attention in personal conversation. His reading of an earlier draft of this paper and subsequent discussion are also much appreciated.

37. Williamson, *Israel*, p. 124 n. 4 (quoting personal conversation with S. Japhet).

38. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 351; cf. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 228.

39. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 382. Williamson's point—that Joshua's later use of the phrase to encourage the people (Josh. 10.25) strengthens the Moses-Joshua/David-Solomon typology—remains unchallenged.

Second, similarly, while it is true that the mention of 'Beersheba to Dan' (2 Chron. 30.5) means that now, under Hezekiah, 'the land is regarded as having returned to its full Solomonic extent',<sup>40</sup> the land had already attained that extent in the time of David (as 1 Chron. 21.2 makes clear), and is never so described in the Solomonic materials, even if it is strongly implied.

Third, application of material to Solomon (that has also been seen as Davidic) is found in 2 Chron. 31.2-3, where Hezekiah restores the divisions of the priests and Levites (v. 2)—as well as the prescribed offerings (v. 3)—after the fashion of Solomon (2 Chron. 8.12-15).<sup>41</sup> Ackroyd, for one, has argued that this 'echoes the activities of David, particularly in 1 Chron. 23-26'.<sup>42</sup> Unfortunately, the whole matter is complicated by the differing views these scholars hold on the presence of redaction in 1 Chronicles 23-27. On Williamson's view, which I have basically adopted in this paper, the Davidic material is secondary—part of the pro-priestly revision—and thus does not preclude the parallel.

Fourth, with a slight alteration of the MT in accordance with the LXX, 2 Chron. 32.22b reads, 'and he gave them *rest* on every side' (NRSV),<sup>43</sup> thereby including Hezekiah among those pious kings who received this special blessing for their faithfulness. While it is true that this concept is especially concerned with Solomon,<sup>44</sup> as Williamson notes, both Asa (14.1, 5-7; 15.5, no parallel) and Jehoshaphat (20.30, no parallel) were also beneficiaries.<sup>45</sup>

Fifth, similarly, Hezekiah's exaltation 'in the sight of all nations', (32.23)—while it does recall Solomon (9.23-24)—is also a part of the Chronicler's distinctive portrait of David (1 Chron. 14.17, no parallel), Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. 17.10-11; 20.29, no parallel) and Uzziah (26.8, no parallel).<sup>46</sup>

40. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 366; *idem*, *Israel*, p. 123.

41. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 373; *idem*, *Israel*, p. 122.

42. P.R. Ackroyd, *1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah* (TBC; London: SCM Press, 1973), p. 187.

43. MT: וינח להם, 'he guided/cared for them'; LXX: κατεπαυσεν αὐτοὺς/להם. See the discussion in Japhet, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 975, 991-92.

44. See R.L. Braun, 'Solomon the Chosen Temple Builder: The Significance of 1 Chronicles 22, 28, and 29 for the Theology of Chronicles', *JBL* 95 (1976), pp. 581-90.

45. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 385.

46. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 385.

Sixth, the same may be said regarding the application of the motif of 'wealth and fame' (32.27-29) to Hezekiah.<sup>47</sup> As my preceding analysis has indicated, this important concept is regularly applied to the Chronicler's favorites.

Along these same lines, however, Dillard has discovered another possible Solomonic allusion in the detail of the reference to 'shields' (מגני) at 2 Chron. 32.27, the section describing Hezekiah's wealth. Though some recent translations (NAB, JB, NJB) have emended the text at this point along the lines of the proposal in *BHS*, to 'jewels/gems' (מגדני), Dillard appropriately remarks, 'Shields were kept in treasuries; this emendation would be at the expense of the author's effort to parallel Hezekiah with Solomon (9.16; 12.9)'.<sup>48</sup>

Halpern repeats many of Williamson's observations and adds one of his own, 'The notion of the priests' self-sanctification occurs only in the accounts of Solomon's and Hezekiah's reigns (2 Chron 5.11; 29.15, 34)'.<sup>49</sup> This is correct, as the Davidic reference in 1 Chron. 15.14—which would make this applicable to David, Solomon, and Hezekiah, not Solomon and Hezekiah alone—is part of the 'pro-priestly' expansion related to 1 Chronicles 23–27.

Eight items, then, meet our criteria: (1) the explicit statement in 2 Chron. 30.26; (2) the community's decision to extend the temple celebrations for an additional seven days (7.14 and 30.23); (3) the utilization of all four of the thematic verbs found in God's answer to Solomon's dedicatory prayer (7.14 and 30.6-19); (4) the echo of omitted material in Solomon's dedicatory prayer (1 Kgs 8.50) on Hezekiah's lips (2 Chron. 30.9); (5) concern for the temple at the time of accession (1.3-8 and 29.3); (6) similar summaries regarding their work on the temple (8.16 and 29.35b); (7) the use of 'shields' as a token of wealth (9.16; 12.9 and 32.27); and (8) the self-sanctification of the priests (5.11 and 29.15, 34). As was the case with the Davidic parallels to Hezekiah above, we may conclude on the basis of this investigation that the Chronicler was also concerned to depict Hezekiah as a second Solomon in ways that other pious Judean kings are not.

47. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 386-87; *idem*, *Israel*, p. 122.

48. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 254.

49. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 50.

*Hezekiah as a Second David and a Second Solomon*

The previous two sections have examined the major attempts to depict Hezekiah as either a second David or a second Solomon. On the basis of the two criteria developed at the start of this study (genuine chronistic material and application of the comparison with David or Solomon to Hezekiah alone), it appears that neither position can be sustained to the exclusion of the other. This suggests that a mediating position, in which Hezekiah is seen as both a second David and a second Solomon, would more fully account for the evidence. Dillard has collected a number of indications that this is precisely the case. It remains for me now to investigate those parallels and determine which are free of *Vorlage* dependence and which apply the comparison with David *and* Solomon to Hezekiah alone.

First, 2 Chron. 31.3, which records Hezekiah's provision for the regular offerings, echoes similar statements about David (1 Chron. 16.37-40) and Solomon (2 Chron. 2.4; 8.12-13).<sup>50</sup>

Second, 'Just as David and Solomon provided from their own wealth for the temple (1 Chr 29.1-5; 2 Chr 9.10-11), so also, Hezekiah provides from his property' (2 Chron. 31.3).<sup>51</sup> The force of this argument is somewhat weakened by the occurrence of this same motif in the reign of Josiah (2 Chron. 35.7-9). The fact that Josiah comes after Hezekiah adds an interesting wrinkle to the discussion in that this later appearance would not prevent the allusion from depicting Hezekiah as a second David and Solomon.

Third, 2 Chron. 31.8, which speaks of Hezekiah blessing the people, recalls the blessing administered by David (1 Chron. 16.2, cf. v. 43). The parallel with Solomon (2 Chron. 6.3) may be questioned on the grounds that 'blessed' (ברך) may function here with the meaning 'greeted' (cf. NAB), though that seems overly scrupulous. As these references are not applied to other kings (with the exception of 31.3) and since they are not present in the Chronicler's *Vorlage*, we may retain them as evidence for the Chronicler's patterning of Hezekiah upon both David and Solomon.

Fourth, a more qualified assessment is required in the matter of the appointment of the priests and Levites (2 Chron. 29.11-14; 31.2, 11-20).

50. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 249.

51. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 249.

While both David (1 Chron. 15.3-24; 23-26) and Solomon (2 Chron. 8.14-15) are involved in this activity,<sup>52</sup> and no other kings are so described, the Davidic references are found in sections regarded as secondary, and the Chronicler has been careful to present Jehoiada, the priest, in this way as well (2 Chron. 23).

Fifth, 2 Chron. 29.31-33, in which the people respond to Hezekiah's appeal with offerings and contributions for the temple, 'mirrors events at the time of David, Solomon, and Moses (Exod 36.6-7; 1 Chr 29.6-9; 2 Chr 7.7)'.<sup>53</sup> This characteristic motif also occurs in the Chronicler's description of Joash's reign (2 Chron. 24.8-14) and appears to be different from the *Vorlage* of 2 Kgs 12.9-16.<sup>54</sup>

Sixth, a similar judgment may be rendered with regard to the motif of 'success' (2 Chron. 31.21; 32.30). In addition to the important occurrences of this term in the reigns of David (1 Chron. 22.11, 13; 29.23) and Solomon (2 Chron. 7.11), Asa's reign is also characterized in this way at 14.6 (EVV v. 7) (no parallel).

A final theme supportive of this position actually arises out of an observation made by Williamson, who notices that the Chronicler is fond of adding a note concerning the assembling of all the people for major occasions.<sup>55</sup> This is especially true with regard to David (1 Chron. 11.3, 4; 23.1; 28.1), Solomon (2 Chron. 1.2; 5.2), and Hezekiah (30.1, 5).

Thus, while not every alleged comparison can be accepted without reservation, three items suggest that there is sufficient warrant for claiming the Chronicler is concerned to present Hezekiah as both a second David and a second Solomon: provision for regular offerings (1 Chron. 16.37-40; 2 Chron. 2.4; 8.12-13; 31.3); the blessing of the people (1 Chron. 16.2; 2 Chron. 6.3; 31.8); and the assembly of all the people (1 Chron. 11.3-4; 23.1; 28.1; 2 Chron. 1.2; 5.2; 30.1, 5).

### *Conclusions*

If, as the evidence presented above would seem to indicate, the Chronicler has made an effort to portray Hezekiah as both a second David and a second Solomon, the question arises as to why he has done so. Two observations may be made by way of conclusion.

52. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 229.

53. Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, p. 237.

54. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 318; *contra* Rudolph.

55. Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 113, 366.

First, while this analysis has challenged Williamson's contention that the Chronicler sought to portray Hezekiah as a second Solomon, his major point, that the Chronicler's reason for this portrayal was to typify the restoration of the situation prevailing under Solomon—that is, the reunification of the old Northern and Southern Kingdoms under Hezekiah<sup>56</sup>—is strongly supported. If the reigns of David and Solomon are seen to be one, the parallels adduced between Hezekiah and Solomon are strengthened by the addition of those between Hezekiah and David, not weakened. Furthermore, once we have rigorously applied our initial criteria to make certain the case that it is the combined reigns of David and Solomon that the Chronicler seeks to reproduce in his portrayal of Hezekiah, many of the alleged parallels that were dispensed with can be cited as secondary evidence for the Chronicler's overall intention to provide a solution to the problem of the divided monarchy.

Further support for this interpretation is to be found in Halpern's interesting observation that there is a decided break in the narrative of Chronicles following the reign of Hezekiah: 'From Manasseh onward, the whole rest/prosperity/salvation complex disappears';<sup>57</sup> 'Hezekiah is the last king of whom it is said that Yhwh was with him, saved him, rescued him, gave him any sort of rest, brought foreigners to pay tribute to him, and so forth'.<sup>58</sup> In addition to the cessation of these common motifs, even such previously regular features as burial and accession formulae undergo observable change following the reign of Hezekiah. In the accession formulae the name of the queen mother disappears after Hezekiah, as does the stipulation of interment 'in the city of David' in the burial notices.<sup>59</sup> All of which leads Halpern to conclude, 'there is an inclusio formed there between Hezekiah and the "United Monarchy"'.<sup>60</sup>

Second, we are led then to ask the question: Are the reigns of David and Solomon best understood as a unity? Recent years have witnessed a growing consensus that they are. Otto Plöger was among the first to propose that David's preparation for and Solomon's construction of the temple formed 'a single, coherent act'.<sup>61</sup> This proposal was substantiated in a

56. See Williamson, *Israel*, pp. 119-31; *idem*, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, pp. 25-26, 350-51; Throntveit, *When Kings Speak*, pp. 110-13.

57. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 41.

58. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 49.

59. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 48.

60. Halpern, 'Sacred History and Ideology', p. 50.

61. Otto Plöger, 'Reden und Gebete in deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtswerk', in *idem*, *Aus der Spätzeit des Alten Testaments: Studien: Zu seinem*



series of works that denied the separation of the David History and the Solomon History into two distinct periods and argued that both kings are treated comparably, since: both were selected by divine choice (1 Chron. 17.11; 22.7-10); both ascended to the throne with the full support of 'all Israel' (11.1-3; 29.22b-25a); and both were equally devoted to the temple cult.<sup>62</sup> Williamson's summary may be taken as illustrative of the current situation that sees the Chronicler concerned 'to present the reign of David and Solomon as a single, unified event within the divine economy for the life of the nation, in which the complementary nature of the two kings' functions plays an important role...'<sup>63</sup> But if the crucial point with regard to the interpretation of these two kings is the complementary nature of their function within a single, unified event, and if the Chronicler is in fact interested in presenting Hezekiah as a return to that golden age of the United Monarchy, his presentation of Hezekiah as a second David *and* a second Solomon is precisely what we should expect.

Furthermore, such an understanding of the Chronicler's purpose has ramifications for the overall structure of the books of Chronicles. The unity of David and Solomon's reigns, along with the theological re-establishment of that unity in the reign of Hezekiah, argues against subdividing the reigns of Saul (1 Chron. 10), David (1 Chron. 11-29), and Solomon (2 Chron. 1-9), and suggests that the following four-part division is most appropriate:

1. 1 Chronicles 1-9 offers a genealogical introduction focusing on the tribes of Judah and Benjamin (who comprised the Chronicler's postexilic audience), Levi (that is, the priests), and the family of David.
2. 1 Chronicles 10-2 Chronicles 9 deals with the United Monarchy of (Saul), David and Solomon. In addition to the material above, this section is framed by two crucial events in the history of the nation, first noticed by Ackroyd and subsequently employed by

60. *Geburtstag am 27.11.1970* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), pp. 50-66 (56): '...einen zusammenhängenden Akt'.

62. R.L. Braun, 'Solomonic Apologetic in Chronicles', *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 503-16; *idem*, 'Chosen Temple Builder'; H.G.M. Williamson, 'The Accession of Solomon in the Books of Chronicles', *VT* 26 (1976), pp. 351-61. For a convenient summary of the evidence see W. Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History* (JSOTSup, 160; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), pp. 85-86.

63. Williamson, 'Eschatology in Chronicles', *TynBul* 28 (1977), pp. 115-54 (140).

- Williamson, Allen, and Throntveit.<sup>64</sup> The end of Saul's reign is marked by the statement that God 'turned the kingdom over to David' (1 Chron. 10.14 NRSV). This is echoed at the beginning of Rehoboam's reign with the statement that the division of the kingdom following Solomon's death 'was a *turn of affairs* brought about by God' (2 Chron. 10.15 NRSV) where 'turned over' and 'turn of affairs' are both based on the Hebrew root נָסַח.
3. 2 Chronicles 10–28 treats the Divided Monarchy. Here the fortunes of Judah following the separation of the Northern Kingdom are measured against the yardstick of the united reigns of David and Solomon.
  4. 2 Chronicles 29–36 is concerned with the Re-United Monarchy from Hezekiah to the Babylonian Exile. The Assyrian defeat of the Northern Kingdom (2 Chron. 30.6) and Ahaz's apostasy (28.6, 24–25) had dramatically reversed the situation at the start of the Divided Monarchy. Through his repair of the temple, reinstitution of worship, and invitation to the North to join in Passover, Hezekiah restores the ideal situation of David and Solomon that had been lost.

64. See P.R. Ackroyd, 'The Chronicler as Exegete', *JSOT* 2 (1977), pp. 2–32 (9); Allen, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 365; M.A. Throntveit, '1 Chronicles', in *HCBC*, p. 319; Williamson, *1 and 2 Chronicles*, p. 96.